

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE | | LING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|-----------------------------|------|------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/763,748 | 0 | 05/29/2001 | Brett P Monia | RTSP-0100 | 1204 | |
| 26259 | 7590 | 06/20/2003 | | | | |
| LICATLA | | ELL P.C. | EXAMINER | | | |
| 66 E. MAIN MARLTON, | | 3 | | SCHULTZ | SCHULTZ, JAMES | |
| h. | | | • | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER, | |
| | | | • | 1635 | 14. | |
| | | | | DATE MAILED: 06/20/2003 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/763,748 | MONIA ET AL. | | | | | |
| , | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | |
| | J. Douglas Schultz | 1635 | | | | | |
| Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspond nce address | | | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 02 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any | | | | | | | |
| earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | | | | | | |
| (a) Ithey raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | | | |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | | |
| (c) \(they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. | | | | | | | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | | | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | | |
| 5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | | | | | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | | | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. | | | | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1, 2, and 5-8 for the same reasons of record cited in the Office action mailed April 2, 2003. | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | | |
| 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is | a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapp | proved by the Examiner. | | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | | | | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303) 009/763,748





Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Applicants' proposed amendment recites targeting regions of the instant target, TRADD of SEQ ID NO: 1, that have not been specifically recited before. Although the full length sequence of SEQ ID NO: 1 has been searched, the individually proposed regions within SEQ ID NO: 1 have not been separately searched, because the search for antisense oligos targeted to the full length of SEQ ID NO: 1 does not necessarily return a complete and exhaustive list of results for fragments or small regions of the full length sequence. Thus, applicants proposed amendment to newly specified regions would necessarily require a new sequence search to be performed for antisense oligos against any particular smaller region of the overall SEQ ID NO: 1. In summary, since said regions have not been recited in any claims examined heretofore, the newly proposed claims specifying particular regions by nucleobase would require a new search and raise new prior art issues not previously considered.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: all arguments contained therein are directed to the claims as set forth in the newly proposed amendment. Since all arguments in the instant request for reconsideration are directed to claims that are not being entered for reasons given above, said arguments are not considered.

JOHN L. LEGUYADER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600